

*Cont
B'* compressibility at least equal to 170 N and in particular in the range 175 N to 300 N.--.

The range of "175 N to 100 N" is obviously in error when referring to claim 7 as originally filed which recites "175 N to 300 N":

The value "100 N" is also obviously in error because the range recites from "175 N to 100 N" which is incoherent with regard to the common practice. As a matter of fact, ranges are usually given by reciting first the lowest limit and then the highest limit.

The correction is further obvious and unambiguous when referring to claim 7 as filed which recites "175 N to 300 N".

REMARKS

The Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner will address the Applicant's remarks as to the Restriction Requirement of March 22, 2002 at the time of allowance.

Nonstatutory double patenting rejection

The Examiner rejects claims 22 to 36 according to the doctrine of the obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1 to 7 of U.S. Patent 6,451,122 and therefore requests a terminal disclaimer.

In conclusion of her examination of the obviousness-type double patenting, the Examiner considers that claims 22 to 36 of the instant application define merely an obvious variation of the invention claimed.